

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action dated May 31, 2005. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4, 7-10, and 13-18 on page 4 of the Office Action. These claims have been amended to the extent required to adopt the Examiner's suggestions for allowance as explained below. Claims 5, 11, and 19-22 have also been amended with a view toward allowance as explained below. Claims 1-3 and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims pending in this application are 4-11 and 12-22. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 4 and 7-10 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner's suggestion has been adopted as follows:

Claim 4 has been rewritten into independent form to include the limitations of claims 1 and 3 from which it previously depended, and is believed to be allowable. Dependent claim 5 has been amended to depend from claim 4. Claim 6 in its original form also depends from claim 4. Accordingly, dependent claims 5 and 6 include all the limitations of claim 4 and are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of claim 4.

Claim 7 has been rewritten into independent form to include the limitations of claims 1, 5, and 6 from which it previously depended, and is believed to be allowable. Claim 8 in its original form depends from claim 7 and has been amended to overcome the examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Amended claim 8 now adds a "longitudinally-extending barrel" to the pistol and clarifies that "the threaded passageway is oriented transversely to the barrel." Accordingly, dependent claim 8 includes all the limitations of claim 7 and is believed to be allowable based on the allowability of claim 7.

Claim 9 has been rewritten into independent form to include the limitations of claims 1, 5, and 6 from which it previously depended, and is believed to be allowable. Claim 10 in its original form depends from claim 9. Dependent claim 11 has been amended to depend from

claim 9 also. Accordingly, dependent claims 10 and 11 include all the limitations of claim 9 and are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of claim 9.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 13-18 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. The Examiner's suggestion has been adopted as follows:

The rejection of claims 13-18 under Section 112 is actually based on independent claim 12 from which these claims depend. Claim 12 stands rejected under Section 112 for lack of antecedent basis for the phrase "the safety." To rectify this problem, and address the Examiner's request for clarification of the safety mechanism, both claims 13 and 14 have been rewritten into independent form and include all of the limitations of claim 12 from which they previously depended. Claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 13 and 14 now recite and clarify that the claimed lever is a "safety lever." Accordingly, claims 13 and 14 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 15 in its original form depends from claim 14. Claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 14 also. Accordingly, dependent claims 15 and 19 include all the limitations of claim 14 and are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of claim 14.

Claims 16-18 in their original form depend directly or indirectly from claim 13 and include all the limitations of claim 13. Accordingly, claims 16-18 are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of claim 13.

Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by United States Patent 5,303,494 to Tuma et al. ("Tuma"). Claim 20 is independent and has been amended to add the step of "rotating a threaded lock pin into engagement with the manual safety." Neither Tuma alone, nor in combination with any other reference of record, teaches or fairly suggests such a step involving a threaded lock pin as now recited in amended claim 20. Accordingly, claim 20 is believed to be allowable. Claims 21 and 22 depend on claim 20 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20, and for the additional limitations added by these dependent claims which further distinguish over the prior art.

In light of the foregoing remarks and claim amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims. The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned attorney at 212-309-6375 if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining issues related to the allowance of any of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: August 30, 2006

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Frank J. Spanitz", is written over a horizontal line.

Frank J. Spanitz
Reg. No. 47,104

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202-739-3000/Fax: 202-739-3001